

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01931 01 OF 02 082111Z

67

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01 H-03 NSC-07 SS-20

DRC-01 ACDA-19 MC-02 /163 W  
----- 006417

P R 082025Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 5082

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1931

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: FRG POSITION ON NON-INCREASE OF FORCES AGREEMENT

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

1. AT APRIL 1 SPC MEETING, FRG DEL CIRCULATED TEXT OF PAPER ENTITLED, "NON-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING WITHIN MBFR," SETTING FORTH GERMAN VIEWS ON NON-INCREASE OF FORCES AGREEMENT. FRG PAPER CLOSELY PARALLELS UK APPROACH (USNATO 1793), AND UK REP AT SPC MEETING SUGGESTED THAT TWO PAPERS BE AMALGAMATED.

2. FULL TEXT OF FRG PAPER FOLLOWS:

BEGIN TEXT

1. SUBSEQUENT TO THE LIST OF SUBJECTS DRAFTED BY THE SENIOR POLITICAL COMMITTEE, MY AUTHORITIES WISH TO COMMENT AS FOLLOWS ON THE QUESTION OF A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING,  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01931 01 OF 02 082111Z

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE QUESTIONS LISTED UNDER III OF THE LIST OF SUBJECTS.

2. IN THEIR ARGUMENTATION AT THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS, THE

SOVIET SIDE IS AT PRESENT PLACING THE MAIN EMPHASIS ON THEIR DEMAND FOR SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS INCLUDING THE FORCES OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AS WELL AS THE AIR FORCES AND NUCLEAR ELEMENTS. SUCH AGREEMENTS ON SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS ARE OBVIOUSLY DESIGNED, ON THE ONE HAND, TO MAINTAIN AND EVEN TO INCREASE THE PRESENT MILITARY IMBALANCE AND, ON THE OTHER HAND, TO ENSURE FROM THE VERY BEGINNING THE IMMEDIATE INCLUSION OF ALL FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA.

3. A NONINCREASE UNDERSTANDING COULD, FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF NEGOTIATION TACTICS, CONSTITUTE AN ACCEPTABLE AND PUBLICITY-EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVE TO THE EASTERN PROPOSAL FOR SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS AND COULD, AT THE SAME TIME, REFUTE THE DEMAND FOR THE EARLY INCLUSION OF THE FORCES OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. IT WOULD UNDERLINE THE STATEMENT THAT THE OVERALL WESTERN MBFR PROGRAMME ALSO PROVIDES FOR THE INCLUSION OF NON-AMERICAN FORCES IN THE SECOND PHASE FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE COMMON CEILING. IT WOULD, HOWEVER, HAVE TO BE ENSURED THAT AIR FORCES AND NUCLEAR ELEMENTS DO NOT COME UNDER A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING.

4. SEVERAL EASTERN DELEGATES HAVE CRITICIZED THE WESTERN CONCEPT OF THE PHASED APPROACH AND OF THE LIMITATION OF REDUCTIONS IN THE FIRST PHASE TO SOVIET AND AMERICAN FORCES ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT COULD NOT BE ENSURED THAT AMERICAN REDUCTIONS IN THE WEST WOULD NOT BE COUNTERBALANCED BY INCREASES IN THE FORCE LEVELS OF OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING WOULD THUS MEET A POINT RAISED BY THE EASTERN SIDE. A CORRESPONDING PROPOSAL BY US COULD BE EXPLAINED BY A DESIRE TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT EASTERN CONSIDERATIONS AND WOULD, TO THIS EXTENT, OFFER A TACTICAL ADVANTAGE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS.

5. WE BELIEVE THAT A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED AND ADOPTED TOGETHER WITH THE OTHER CONTENTS OF THE FIRST PHASE. AN ASSURANCE OR DECLARATION OF INTENT PRIOR TO THE ENTRY INTO CONCRETE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD HAVE TO CONFINE  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01931 01 OF 02 082111Z

ITSELF TO NOTING THAT THE WESTERN SIDE IS PREPARED

-TO NEGOTIATE ABOUT THE CONTENT AND FORM OF A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING AS SOON AS NEGOTIATIONS ABOUT THE OTHER CONTENTS OF THE FIRST PHASE ARE BEGUN, AND

- IF THE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE FIRST PHASE ARE SATISFACTORILY CONCLUDED, TO MAKE A CORRESPONDING DECLARATION JOINTLY WITH THE EASTERN SIDE.

6. A COLLATERAL UNDERSTANDING OF THIS KIND SHOULD BE AS SIMPLE AS POSSIBLE. IT SHOULD THEREFORE ONLY EXTEND TO THE MANNING LEVELS OF THE LAND FORCES. THEIR EQUIPMENT AS WELL

AS THE AIR FORCE AND THE NUCLEAR ELEMENTS SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED. IN ADDITION TO THE DEMAND FOR SIMPLICITY, THIS WOULD ALSO ENSURE THAT A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING DOES NOT RENDER QUALITATIVE CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS ON THE WESTERN SIDE MORE DIFFICULT.

7. THE UNDERSTANDING WOULD HAVE TO EXTEND TO THE GROUND FORCE LEVELS OF EACH SIDE WITHIN THE REDUCTION AREA WHICH IS CREATED ONCE THE SOVIET AND AMERICAN REDUCTION PARTS OF THE FIRST PHASE HAVE BEEN WITHDRAWN. IT WOULD HAVE TO BE ENSURED THAT, AS FAR AS THE WEST IS CONCERNED, THE TOTALITY OF THE REMAINING GROUND FORCES IS USED AS A BASIS. IT DOES NOT APPEAR NECESSARY TO GIVE SPECIAL EMPHASIS TO THE LEVELS OF SOVIET AND AMERICAN FORCES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING SINCE A DETERMINATION OF THEIR SIZE IS ALREADY WITHIN THE LOGIC OF A FIRST-PHASE REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 01931 02 OF 02 082132Z

67

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01 H-03 NSC-07 SS-20

ACDA-19 DRC-01 MC-02 /163 W  
----- 006689

P R 082025Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 5083

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1931

8. THE REPLY TO THE QUESTION WHETHER HUNGARY SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN SUCH AN UNDERSTANDING WOULD HAVE TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FORCE LEVEL IN HUNGARY COULD BE SAFEGUARDED BY A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE IN THE REDUCTION AGREEMENT. IN VIEW OF THE PECULIARITIES OF HUNGARY'S POLITICAL SITUATION, IT SHOULD BE IN THE WESTERN INTEREST TO TRY TO OBTAIN A SPECIAL ARRANGEMENT FOR HUNGARY OUTSIDE A GLOBAL CEILING APPLICABLE TO THE OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ON THE WARSAW PACT SIDE.

9. A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING SHOULD TAKE THE NEGOTIATION AIM OF THE COMMON CEILING FOR GROUND FORCES AS A GUIDELINE AND SHOULD FACILITATE THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THIS OBJECTIVE. THIS MEANS THAT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATO'S BASIC POSITION, SUCH AN UNDERSTANDING WOULD DEPEND ON THE WILLINGNESS OF THE OTHER SIDE TO EMBRACE THE COMMON-CEILING CONCEPT.

10. THE BINDING STATEMENT ON THE NON-INCREASE OF THE FORCE LEVEL SHOULD BE SYNCHRONIZED, AS FAR AS ITS TIMING IS CONCERNED,  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01931 02 OF 02 082132Z

WITH THE CONCLUSION OF THE NEGOTIATIONS ABOUT THE REDUCTION OF SOVIET AND AMERICAN GROUND FORCES IN THE FIRST PHASE. IN THIS WAY, IT WOULD PROVIDE THE MAXIMUM BENEFIT FOR OUR TACTICAL APPROACH TO THE NEGOTIATIONS.

11. A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE DURATION OF THE NEGOTIATIONS OR TO A SPECIFIC PERIOD OF TIME. IF THE NEGOTIATIONS ARE BROKEN OFF OR THE COMMON CEILING IS AGREED, THE UNDERSTANDING WOULD BE AUTOMATICALLY CANCELLED.

12. AN UNDERSTANDING IN WHICH ALL THE GROUND FORCES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WERE INCLUDED COULD HAVE A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON THE WAY IN WHICH THE GROUND FORCES OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ARE INCLUDED IN A SECOND-PHASE AGREEMENT. THE FORM OF THE UNDERSTANDING WOULD THEREFORE HAVE TO MEET THE GLOBAL REQUIREMENTS ON OUR SIDE; ANY DIFFERENTIATION BY NATIONAL FORCES WOULD HAVE TO BE STRICTLY AVOIDED.

13. AT THE SAME TIME, SUCH AN UNDERSTANDING COULD BRING THE ALLIANCE AS A WHOLE INTO PLAY IN CONNECTION WITH THE SIGNING OF AN MBFR AGREEMENT. THIS WOULD BE POSSIBLE ON THE BASIS

-OF THE RECORD OF A PLENARY MEETING SHOWING THAT ONE REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE WESTERN SIDE AND ONE FROM THE EASTERN SIDE MADE SIMILAR STATEMENTS;

- OF AGREED COLLATERAL STATEMENTS BY NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT ON OR NEAR THE DATE OF THE SIGNING OF AGREEMENTS ON THE FIRST NEGOTIATING PHASE.

THE FINAL FORMAT OF A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING WOULD, OF COURSE, BEAR IN MIND THE FORMAT OF THE AGREEMENTS ON THE FIRST PHASE. THIS APPLIES ESPECIALLY TO THE QUESTION OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ALLIANCE AS SUCH CAN APPEAR IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS ON THE FIRST PHASE.

14. IN PREPARING AND CONCRETIZING A NO-INCREASE UNDERSTANDING, THE WESTERN SIDE SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS, AMONG OTHERS:

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01931 02 OF 02 082132Z

-THE INTERCHANGEABILITY OF NATIONAL ELEMENTS IN THE GROUND  
FORCES OF THE ALLIANCE AS A WHOLE;

-QUALITATIVE CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS OF THE FORCE STRUCTURE;

-THE REQUIREMENTS OF NATO'S INTEGRATED STRUCTURE;

-COOPERATION IN THE PROCUREMENT AND PRODUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

END TEXT

RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 08 APR 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO01931  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740482/abbryugh.tel  
**Line Count:** 232  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 06 MAY 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** WITHDRAWN <20-Jul-2001 by reddocgw, RDFRD>; RELEASED <06 MAY 2002 by golinofr>; APPROVED <07 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: FRG POSITION ON NON-INCREASE OF FORCES AGREEMENT  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO BONN  
LONDON  
VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005